R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1904-05

(Misc)

File No. 69-04

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Agrathirtha Maryade in certain Vishnu Temples.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

S.11] 1908.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 78

FILE HEADING.

Claim of Sri Parakala Matt for Agra Thirtha honours in certain Vishnu temples in the State.

From The President of the Agra Thirtha Spl. Committee.

Letter No. A Dated 31-3-1910 Received 15-4-1910

Diary No. 1948	Enclos. 17	Spare Copies	Serial No. 6

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits for the information of Government the report of the Spl Committee appointed for investigating into the claims of the Sri Parakala Matt to Agra Thirtha & others honours in certain Vishnu temples in the State.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

(1) Sri A[illegible] Temple [illegible]

[illegible]

(2) Sri [illegible] Temple at [illegible]

[illegible]

(3) Sri [illegible]

Temple [illegible]

NOTES—First sheet

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

2

A

Serial No.

(4) Sri Venkata-ramanaswami Temple at Malekal-Tirupati and Sri Kesavaswami (not Rama Devaru) emple at Banavar in the Arsikere Tk.

[illegible]

B

i.e.,

D

E

Note.—Contn. sheet

GPB—55,000—27-4 05

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial
No.

[illegible]

and

Pages 1 to 4 in [illegible])

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—55,000—27-4 08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

H ✓

pages 5-14 in printers book)

[illegible]

page 14 of Printers book)

9 ✓

Note—Contn sheet

GPB—55,000—27 4 05

G. R. S. 12.]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

[illegible]

K ✓

[illegible] 16-17 in printed copy)

[illegible])

The Maharaja
^

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

the committee for consideration along with the other cases before it.

12. In July 190[illegible] [illegible] claimed precedence over the [illegible] family, in the matter of [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] Govt. [illegible] H [illegible] order No. 704 dated 5th September 1907 [illegible] -tee for investigation [illegible] asked to state in the event of the [illegible] not being [illegible] -tled to [illegible] family [illegible] entitled to [illegible].

L ✓ para 18 in Printed book)

para. 21-22 in printed book).

13. For various reasons, the committee had to be reconstituted from time to time, [illegible] now consisting of [illegible] [illegible] has submitted its report.

M ✓ paras 23-49 in printed book)

14. It will be seen [illegible] are:- (1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) [illegible]

(4) [illegible]

Serial No.

hotly

N ✓

a

d

Inculpate

matter was [illegible] to the [illegible] of the Committee

File No. of 190

Serial No.

✓ ✓
Q + P (Pages 83 & 84 to printed book).
Q ✓

69 to 6/2

perused.

R ✓

...n sheet.

Serial No.

to satisf... [illegible]

[illegible]

for the [illegible]

[illegible] a

[illegible] ot

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] appointed. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] was.

O2 [illegible]

[illegible] (See also Ex: Mr. in Mother Case)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

A [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] at

[illegible]

[illegible]

D+E [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

S [illegible] e

J+2c. [illegible] press-

[illegible]

Note—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

See 89 (printed book).

6f

that

Mallur Case.

Coming now to the Mallur case discussed by the Committee in paras [illegible] of their

39 [illegible] (printed book).

W (20 No 5)

x

p. 2090-94 of Pinkes book)

Y

report, I beg to suggest a perusal, to start with, of the Office-note prepared by Clerk Byata Rao in 1889 and of my note (Appendix 9) prepared at the request of the Committee which give a history of the case.

25. In para 5 of the printed arguments for the Parakala Matt in this case, it is said that the Matt have clearly proved that they had Gumastas in this temple from 1814 to 1874. I should say that there is no satisfactory evidence to shew that the Matt had a succession of Gumastas here from 1811 to 1864 for except Subedar Keshagiraiya's letter of the year Bhava (1814), Ex. Y, referring to Chicka Mallur Venkata Char as Matt Gumasta there is no other document referring to a Gumasta. The Committee seem to be of opinion that the Matt having proved the existence of a Gumasta in 1814 it must be presumed that this system continued, and that the opposite party has to prove that this system terminated. They hold " that after the issue of the Nirup of 1811 the Matt had Gumastas for receiving the Agra Thirtha, that it must be presumed to have so received the honors for many years until 10 or 15 years prior to 1864. There are some petitions of the Matt's opponents (Ex. III and Joint Exbts. I and IV) which give room to the surmise that there were other Gumastas also, that the Awars were themselves Matt Gumastas for some years and later on claimed the Agra Thirthas in their own right.

Z

A, B, C.

26. When in 1864 the Matt applied for a recog-

-tio

Serial No.

recognition of its Gumasta's right the Embars as a matter of fact were getting the first Thirtha, Anadam Pillays and Nallan Chakravarthis the second, and Veerambudhis the third. An attempt has been made by the Matt to explain away in the concluding portion of para 5 of the arguments this enjoyment by the Embars. After enquiry on receipt of the Matt's application in 18[illegible]4 the Matt's right was allowed and the Matt Gumasta enjoyed Agra Thirtha practically undisturbed till his death in 1872 or so.

Y

27. When the right of the Parakala Matt Gumasta was thus recognised the Embars seem to have discontinued attending the temple at Sattumurai when chiefly the question of precedence arises. After the death of Gumasta Tirumala Tatha Char the Matt does not appear to have appointed another Gumasta at once. So, the Anandan Pilllay family who seem to have continued visiting the temple began to get Agra Thirtha (Vide Court Ex. ~~IV~~ III) and this was the state of things when Mr. Setlur Tirumala Char became Amildar of Channapatna in 1874. There seems to have been an attempt on his part to get the Agra Thirtha for the Embars who were his Gurus.

A2

The Matt then woke up and asserted its right (Ex PP). The Anandan Pillays and Veerambudhies also agitated. It was decided that the Sannad of 1819 in their favour was genuine and should be given effect to (Ex. 11). This was communicated to the Matt and the Acharyapurushas. The Matt, however, did nothing till 1886. The allegation of the Matt

B2

C

C2

[illegible]

that they had no part at all in the enquiry of 1874 is true. The Matt merely wrote a Yadi and did nothing more. They were not called upon to substantiate their claim. In the subsequent proceedings only the rival Acharyapurushas have been examined.

28. Though the decision was in favor of Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhis they do not seem to have got Agra Thirtha for any length of time. The Embars when they agitated were first informed that they should establish their right in a Civil Court (Ex. 15) and that nothing could be done without the consent of Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhis. Later on, after recording the deposition of Anandam Pillay Thirumala Char, Amildar Mr. Venkataranga Iyengar directed that the terms of the deposition.apparently to the effect that the Agra Thirtha should be given to the Embars (who were his Gurus) should be carried out. (Ex.34) This deposition is now missing.

D2 ✓

29. There are no records between 1875 and 1885. In the latter year (but before the succession of the present Swami and not after, as stated by Rai Bahadur Mr. A. Srinivassacharlu in his note) the Matt without one word about the previous proceedings again asserted their right, (Ex.[illegible]). The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt., decided that the matter had been settled once before and he could do nothing. The Matt then appealed to Government who in 1895 passed the order now sought to be reviewed.

E2 ✓

G ✓

[illegible]

30.

30. During the interval between 1885 and 1895 and subsequently also there were frequent disputes between Anandam Pillays and Ambars about Agra Thirtha, the Veerambudhis scarcely figuring in these. Any attempt to enforce the order in favor of the Anandam Pillays would be frustrated (Vide remark against Ex. 25) till in February 1906 Amildar Mr. Ramachandra Rao got it enforced. Ambar Krishnama Char then began to complain to Government and finally his petition was, as stated in para 12 above, referred to the Committee.

31. In the previous paragraphs I have given a brief history of the Mallur case and shown also what the actual practice was. The documents in the case have now to be dealt with. The important --- documents may be classified as primary and secondary. Under the first class comes the Nirup of 1811 (Ex. B) upon which the Matt bases its claim and the Nirups of 1819 (Exbs. 9 and 10) upon which Anandam Pillay Apprameya Iyengar bases his claim. Amildar Homia's letter (Ex. Z), the Kanartia Kanadari of June 1831 (Ex. V), the depositions of 1834 (Ex. D.D) the patti of Budhiroogari (Court Ex. 9) the Sha Amal copy of order to Bangalore Fouzdar in terms of Exbs. 9 and 10 (Ex. 27) come under the second class.

A
B, C,
D,
E,
F,
G,
H,

32. I was under the impression that the genuineness of Ex. B. was practically conceded by the Matt's opponents as it was alleged that the reason for granting the Sannads (Exbs. and 10) in their favor was the existence of a Sannad giving the

4

Serial No.

the [illegible] airline to [illegible] alleges that [illegible] each flight [illegible] the left [illegible] the complainant [illegible] [illegible] placement [illegible] parties of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]	I This is not genuine	This is not genuine
[illegible]	for the following reasons:-	as will be seen from
[illegible]	(1) It does not bear the	the fact,
[illegible]	usual Khat	(i) That it does not
[illegible]	(2) Being a circular it	bear the name of the
[illegible]	does not bear the dates of	Scribe,
[illegible]	receipt etc., by any	(ii) That it does not
[illegible]	of the Taluk Amildars,	bear the Signature
[illegible]	Temple Parapathegars	of the different Amildars
[illegible]	and other addressees	etc, to whom it is
[illegible]	Concerned; not ~~is~~ if	addressed,
[illegible]	registered in any of	(iii) That it does not
[illegible]	the Taluk or Temple	Contain the autograph
[illegible]	books.	of His Highness Sri
[illegible]	(3) It does not contain	Krishnaraja Wodeyar,
[illegible]	the usual autograph	III.
[illegible]	of His Highness who	II It is personal to
[illegible]	made it a point to write	Sri Ghantavatara
[illegible]	the mandate with his	Parakala Swami
[illegible]	own hand at the end.	alone, and the Sentence
[illegible]	(4) The Signature of	[illegible] . . . [illegible]
[illegible]	His Highness is false	[illegible], is a clear
[illegible]	and does not correspond	interpolation. This
[illegible]	with those in the	Can be fairly inferred

Throughout the proceedings in connection with the Agratirtha Maryadas, not only in the Mallur Temple, but also in a large number of Vaishnava temples in the State this Nirup has been repeatedly referred to, relied and acted upon, as the several exhibits filed in the case go to show. Vide Exhibits. C, D, E, F, K. L, M. N, O, R. S. T, U. V. W, X, Y. Z, AA, BB, CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, MM, NN, OO, PP, QQ and TT.

As regards the

First, as regards the genuineness of the Nirup of 1811. The document has been practically admitted by the representatives of the Counter-Petitioners at the various enquiries in which they were concerned and cited and referred to in exhibits filed on both sides. It has now however been objected to on the various grounds set down in the printed Memorandum of the Arguments of the first Counter-Petitioner (Vide Page 1). No importance can be attached to the absence of the name of the

[illegible] శ్రీ స్వామివార్లవారు
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] శ్రీ స్వామివార్లవారు
[illegible]
[illegible] శ్రీ స్వామివార్లవారి [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(శ్రీ) కృష్ణ [illegible]

genuine Nirups of the same period.

(5) The original was not produced in 1864 in the Mallur case though repeatedly called for.

(6) The original was produced for the first time in 1888 and that in an uncalled for manner.

(7) There is no reference to it in the Sha Amal book in the Central Records.

(8) That the second sentence "[illegible] ..... [illegible]" did not exist in the unfabricated original may be inferred from Exhibits Y, Z, bb, DD, in the Mallur case which repeat only its first clause relative from Exhibits X, Y, cc, dd, etc, which repeat only the clause relative to Sri valāra Parakala and not to the Gumasta.

III From the (i) that the unfabricated original of this Exhibit is clearly referred to as a Rahadari by S Amal Munsiff (Vide Ex. 40 in the Yatiraja Mutt case), (ii) that the original of this Exhibit was not produced repeatedly called for between 1864 1874 and (iii) that it was for the first time produced in 1888 by a third party in an unconnected

Construction of — Exhibit B, it is alleged by the Counter-petitioner that the Nirup was only personal to Ghantavatara Parakalaswami. That it is not so personal to the said Swami is clear from the following exhibits:- W, addressed to Sreenivasa Bramhatantra Parakala Swami the Successor of Ghantavatara Parakalaswami in which the last three sentences direct~~ing~~ly bear on the question. X addressed to Sir Mark Cubbon in 1856 after several Parakalaswamies has succeeded —

writer or any autograph writing of His Highness above his signature. The wording of this document itself shows that it was given to the Parakala Mutt. It is difficult to say now at this distance of time whether this original was shown to any Amildars or why they did not endorse the fact thereon, but the Mutt records show that an exact copy (Ex. EEE) of this document was sent by the Amildar of Serangapatna to that of Channapatna in 1864 (Vide Ex. EEE). The 1st Counter-Petitioner Appramaya Iyengar submitted a petition (Exhibit 28) stating to the Ghantavatara Parakalaswami

(9) There is no continuity of ideas in the several parts of the first sentence, and there is unnecessary repetition as between the first and second sentences

II That it is a Rahadari forged into a Nirup is evident from the following facts:—

(1) It is cited as a Rahadari in Ex. 40.

(2) The expressions "[illegible]", "[illegible]", etc. clearly indicate the Rahadari nature of the document.

III Even if the document were genuine, it is no authority to say that it conferred

Case, [illegible] secure for its existence an official attestation, it is clear that the Parakala Matt whose attempt to introduce Gumastas was checked by His Highness in 1819 lay low for a period of 40 years, and about 1860 with the advent of a new Swami it renewed the attempt and after it was able to secure in 1862 a Nirup conferring Agramacharyapada to its Gumasta in Sri Prasanna Krishna Swamy temple at Mysore, it has forged the present Exhibit with a view one after another in which the continuance of the agramaryadas granted under the Nirups of 1811 (Ex B) and 1831 (Ex. V) is insisted upon. These are from the Maharaja himself who granted the Nirup Exhibit B. They show that the privilege is not personal to one single Swami but appertained to the successive Swamis of the Parakala Matt.

Besides, at the accession of each subsequent Swami to the Peeta, Government have been passing proceedings declaring the continuance of all

his doubts as regards the genuineness of Exhibit B, but the doubts are not very tangible and have no force in my opinion.

Similar objections have been urged by the Yathiraja Matt also (See Pages 5 and 6 of the printed memorandum of arguments in that case) the question about its construction will be considered further on a right to appoint Gumasthas for "Agrathirtha" honors in the temples of Mysore for the following reasons :—

The document is purely personal to Sri Ghantavatara Parakala Swami and cannot be held to be operative with reference to the Successive Swamis much less to their Gumastas.

(2) Even if the words "[illegible]" existed in the unfabricated original, they can only have reference to the nominees ~~and~~ to the holy Seat in Succession (vide also Exhibit 35)

to claim this privilege in Temples in the

The important to be noticed in

Connection, is the in which this has been gr brought to the of Government.

The contending

Whenever was a

for the original, Meath Studiously avoided its production, and by Virtue of its influence forced the authorities to recognise the unverified copy itself as a valid document for a period of nearly 25 years.

The signature does

honors to him & Exhibits U.U., V.V W.W, X.X, and Y.Y. The other evidence in this case both oral and documentary clearly proves the enjoyment of the Agramariyada in a large number of temples in the State up till now in accordance with Exhibits B and V.

It is next urged by the Counsel Petitioner that Exhibit B does not empower enjoyment through a proxy. Not only does the whole evidence in the Case establish the feebility of the objection but also the clear terms of

IV Even the very idea of a Gumasta an Agrathirtha honors to him on behalf of the Parakalaswami was repugnant to Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar, III can be seen not only from the Nirup of 1819 but also from the Ayakattupatte dated 14th March 1829 of Sri Prasanna Krishnaswami Temple at Mysore. No doubt, the Parakala Mutt ~~successively~~ successfully induced His Highness to confer this honor on its Gumasta in 1862; but the points to

not appear to be His Highness'.

Ashtagrama Amildar who, in 1864 sent a copy to Channapatna, has not noted on the original that it had been produced before ~~them~~ him.

Embar Krishnamachar's Arguments.

The Nirup of 1811 which is a circular to all Amildars etc., does not appear to have been received and registered in the Channapatna and Closepet Taluks. It is evident from the Amildar's orders No 2 dated 27.7.1864 to the Parpathegar of the Mallur temple, that no reference of this Nirup was forthcoming

Exhibits B and V and the theory on which the Counter Petitioner and predecessors base their contention how tenable the objection is. Vide Exhibits, C, D, E, G, K. L. M. N. O, R, U, AA, BB, CC, DD, EE, FF, RR, TT, in which enjoyment of the honors by the Mutt's Gumastas is recognized. In Exhibit DD Anil Tirumalachar himself states that he obtained copy of the Nirup of 20 May 1811 Exhibit B) issued the Maddur luk and found it that the be noticed are (1) that ~~Hogbo~~ His Highness was not inclined to ~~create~~ tolerate this absurdity of a proxy to receive the personal honors of Sri Parakala Swami for nearly 33 years even in this temple founded and endowed by himself and (2) that His Highness in the Nirup of 1862 makes no mention of the alleged Nirup of 1811 by which the Parakalamatt claims to have secured this honor to its Gurus in all the Vishnu temples of the Province. Therefore Exhibit 18 cannot

in the Channapa Taluk and that only a copy of it was sent for from the Patna Ashagram Taluk. All Amildar seem to have taken necessary action simply upon the copies received from Sri Parakala Matt believing that the original in the Matt must be genuine.

Honors should be given to the Matt's [illegible] The oral evidence also proves the enjoyment by proxies. Vide State-ments of Petitioners' witnesses 1, 5, 6, 7, 9 10 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 17, 18, 19 and Counter-Petitioner's 4th Witness

evidently be an in-
genuine Nirup
(the Ayakattupatti
of 1829 and the
Nirup of 1862 may
be kindly sent for
and perused).

V Even if genuine,
This can in no way
Superseded the
Subsequent order
of 1831 in favour
of the Yathiraja Math.

Both in this case and in the Yethiraja Matt case reference is made to the Ayakat Patti of 1829 of the Prasanna Krishnaswami Temple in Mysore Fort and the Nirup of 1862 in connection with this Temple. In the arguments in the latter case the Committee have been requested to send for these and peruse them. It is alleged that His Highness the late Maharaja Krishna Raja Wodeyar, III, stoutly set his face against the appointment of a gumasta in the Krishnaswami Temple and recognized a gumasta only in 1862. This however has not been proved; and I am not sure that the Nirup of 1862 (Ex. V. in the Yethiraja Matt case) means that the Gumasta was for the first time recognized in that year.

Y1 ✓

As requested by the parties I wrote to the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments and obtained the Ayakat Patti of 1829 of this Temple signed by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishna Raja Wodeyar, III, Extracts therefrom referring to the Parakala Matt have been marked as Ex. X. in the Yethiraja Matt case. --- There is no reference in this to Agra Thirtha or Matt gumasta. A comparison of this with Ex. 34(b) and 36 in the Yethiraja Matt case, i.e., Hukumnama of 1830 and Ayakat Patti of 1831 the genuineness of both of which is denied by the Yethiraja Matt, will be helpful in coming to a conclusion about the genuineness of the two latter.

9 ✓

X1 ✓ L1 ✓

32. After all it is admitted that there was an order issued by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishna Raja Wodeyar, III, authorizing the Matt

gumasta

Serial No.

Gumasta to receive the Agra Thirtha due to the Matt ; and undoubtedly in some temples the gumasta is receiving such Agra Thirtha. The questions for consideration are (1) whether this was modified by a subsequent Nirup as urged and (2) whether this is to be continued or not whatever the finding about the genuineness of the particular docement Ex. B. may be.

33. With regard to Exbs. 9 and 10 also I append statements in which have been placed in juxtaposition the arguments urged by the parties for and against their genuineness and the Committee's findings.

General Notes

of 1819.

ಶ್ರೀ

[illegible]

This is a circular Nirup which clearly excludes the appointment of Gumattas in all temples exclusive of Melkote and Srirangapatna. To make it exclude the above mentioned places is a mis-interpretation of its real import. The seeming exclusion is in the introductory part wherein the words of Swami are quoted, but not in the final mandate of the Maharaja which applied to all temples without any exception. This fact is borne out by the references in the Sha Amal Book addressed to the Fouzdar and the practice then in force in Melkote and Srirangapatna temples.

This is a circular Nirup explicitly prohibiting the app of Gumattas in Vishnu temples, to receive Agra Mb It is a mistake to interpret this Sannad as the temples of Mb and Srirangapatam For, what appears at the outset as an exclusion, is only in the introductory part where in the Swami's words are quoted, but not in the final mandate of the Maharaja. The final order is equally applicable to all the temples in the Province. This fact is clearly borne out from the copy of the order addressed to the Fouzdar, obtained from the Sha Amal Book in the Central Records and filed as an Exhibit by the Counter-Petitioner.

This is an important document. Its genuineness has not been proved. It does not come from proper custody; how any private individual could come by its possession and produce it before the authorities is not explained. The writing and the freshness of the ink are ~ suspicious. No ~ reference to this ~ Sannad is forth-coming in the Sha amal Record. The copy produced by the Counter-Petitioner at the close of his arguments in this Case is most ~ suspicious, and the Petitioner begs that the Sha amal record for the year 1819 and for one year before and one year after 1819 may be sent for and inspected by the Committee after giving Petitioner's

meteri
for the c
in the

Gyne
S
(Exbo.
which
nentr
dire
ed in
is a

num
except
p
M
other
the
honors
Shor

and
P
the P

Cegra
when
temple
× ×
×

most
question
ideration
is the
of the
Special
of 1819
no 10)
time,
ze the
s contain-
.B. Ex.B
lar
to a
of Taluks
~
Sriranga-
and ~
in all
him temples
Thir Ma
ould be
local
purushas
to the
a Matt.
, and that
ala Swami
the
aryada
visits the
person.
× ×
× ×
documents

[illegible]

Merely One Embar somehow obtained a copy of this general Sannad which conferred honor the local Acharya purushas and its production wanted to secure Agrathirtha honors for himself, it is no argument to that the Sannad itself is not genuine. On the other hand it only reflects on the officer, a disciple of this Embar, who without enquiry how a private person happened to produce an official document, recommended him on the strength of the same to Agra thirtha honors.

Konairy's order of 1821 which appears to have been produced

Advocate an ~ opportunity to make his submissions in reference to the said copy. The Amal record would appear to consist of loose sheets of paper making it exceedingly easy to foist any ~ spurious document. Though the genuineness of this Sannad is being denied from 1874 it is only at the fag end of the ~ arguments in this case, that the said authenticated ~ copy ~~has~~ was ~ obtained and produced. The contents of the said copy have to be scrutinized and compared with those of Exhibit 9 and Exhibit 10.

This Sannad Exhibit 9 was not recorded in the temples nor in the Cuttecheries

were never referred to in any of the Proceedings prior to 1874. A copy of the General Mutha Sannad (Ex. 9) was produced in that case by the ancestor of Embar Krushnamacharu, but it is not clear how he got the copy or with what party Amildar Srinivasachar found the original (Vide Ex. DD) and the original was finally produced before Mr. Sreenivasachallu, Mungrai Secretaru by ~ Veerambudhi Sreenivasiengar in 1893. It bears endorsements of having been produced at different Taluks on different dates. The order of the Taluks in which they were produced and the ~ intervals between the different date of production appear

దు. తారీఖు 31 [illegible]
[illegible] 1819 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

just to prove Gumatta's Enjoyment of the at this period, not to be relied upon as it was not enforced in the temple. C.V. remarks on Ex.

Further the fact that the Embars did not produce this General Sannad in the Magadi case in 1838 does not go against its genuineness; for it is to be noted that the Embars were able to secure their rights by the production of their special Nirups only. If copies are not forthcoming in the Taluk records it is not at all surprising. For, we know as a matter of fact, even the valuable Government records of this period cannot be had now of any of the Taluk in the Mysore State, as it should have been if it were really issued in 1819. No references to it are forthcoming even in the very Taluks whose endorsements purport to have been made on it. The terms of this Sannad are not shewn to have been acted upon either in Malur temples or in those of other Taluks or in those of even the Taluks which are expressly named in the Sannad. On the contrary the oral and documentary evidence referred to above proves the undoubted fact that in a large number of temples in the Mysore State the practice of

to mine doubts the

of the entries. su are noted below.

Date. - Sannad 13th day of Kartheeka Suddha - year P

Taluks at which it was procured	On what dates.	Interval.
[illegible]	15th. Karthika Sudda.	2 days.
[illegible]	2[illegible] Margasira — do —.	17 —
[illegible]	[illegible] — do — Balala	1[illegible] —
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nelamangala	1st Pushya Bahula.	[illegible]
[illegible]	5th. Magha — do —.	34 —
[illegible]	14th. — do —.	[illegible] —
[illegible]	19th. [illegible] — do.	[illegible] —

Port for the preservation. time honored records in the Central Office the Government many a v document c have been belied and even the reference to the Nirup might have been

The argument that This Nirup was not acted upon in 1864 is rediculous, when as a matter of fact the decision of 1864 was *exparte* and This order itself was cancelled, soon after

The document had come before various officers of Government in all Agrathirta disputes of the Madur temple and have been held to be genuine.

" the first to the acharyas of the Parakala Matt has all along obtained and still obtains. Such a practice could not have originated or continued if Exhibit 9 were genuine and were really issued by the Maharaja. In 1821 within two years after this alleged Sannad Amildar Konaiya issued the order directing that the first honors should be paid to the Matt in accordance with previous order. Exhibit 9 was not then produced or referred to. The Matt's Gumastas continued to receive the Matt's honors as submitted above. In 1838

The al e mentioned except Mysore, amangala and Man a are not mentione in the body of the Sannad, while Maddur and Magadi which Taluks were specially mentioned in the Sannad, have not made any endorsement on the document. It may be stated that other Taluks were generally referred to as "others". The Muzrai Under-Secretary has ascertained that there is no reference to this Sannad in any of the Taluks referred to.

The

the Math again

the
its genuineness

This

frivolous.

Embars

* * * *

* * * *

The General Circular Nirup of 1819 was produced in the 1895 to the then Muzrai Superintendent. In this it is directed that local Acharyapurushas shall receive Thirtha: subject to the local usage. [In the special Nirup it is directed that Anandam Pillay Sringriengar and Veerambudhi Sreenivasiengar shall receive thirtha etc., subject to local usage.] Granting that these Nirups are genuine, it will be seen that the

the enjoy-
of the Matt's
by its ~
was ~
directly in question.
Exhibit 9 was not
ced or ~
relied upon though
Magadi is one of
the Taluks ~
specially ~~men~~
mentioned in it
and though the
Embars were
themselves the
plaintiffs in that
Case. Vide Exhibit
Sannad I.

In 1864 when
enquiry was
held into the
question of appointment
of a Gumasta
for the Matt for
receiving the Matt's
honors in the
Temple at Malur.
Exhibit 9 was
not produced or
relied upon.
The Gumasta of
the Matt appointed
in 1864 was
allowed to enjoy
the Matt's honor

Ruling who issued them was very considerate in so wording them Because he must have known that the local usage in various temples must be different depending on the rank and position of the several Acharyapurushas residing in various localities.

Accordingly, the time-honored usage in the Temples of Malur, etc., in the Chamapatna Taluk, was being observed up to 8th February 1906 by giving the Agrathirtha to the Embars in virtue of their position in Guruparampara, the Second Agra thirtha to Anandam Pillay and Nallan Chakravarthies jointly, and the third Agra thirtha to Veerambudhis.

had been, without let or ~~hindrance~~ hinderance, till his death in 1874. If Exhibit 9 were genuine this would not have been tolerated.

The untenable character of the reason on which Ex. 9 is stated to have been granted, namely, that [illegible] should not take precedence of Yatis etc., has already been pointed out.

In 1838 Ex. W and in 1856 Ex X the Maharaja has explicitly stated in his letters to the Parakala Swami and to Sir Mark Cubbon, respectively ~~ively~~, that he not repealed, i.e., cancelled or modified the honors granted by him to his Guru Parakala the said. honors should be continued in tact. and that unscrupolous persons had got up false Nirups to the contrary. In this connection it is prayed that the Committee will be pleased to read the Maharaja's letter in Kanarese which in original accompanies the English letter to Sir Mark Cubbon, and note that the word "alone" used in English letter is not to be found in Kanarese equivalent in the Kanarese letter. The word alone" used in the English letter signifies that the first honors are payable only to the Parakala Matt and to no other Matt or individual unconnected with i.e Parakala Matt and not at the Counter — Petitioner tries to make out that the said honors are payable only to the Swami and not to his Gumasta

In the face of so many infirmative considerations applicable to Exhib 9 as submitted above, the Petitioner submits that Ex. 9 cannot be presumed to be genuine merely because it ~~is~~ purports to be more than 30 years old

Special Numbs
of 1819.

[illegible]

(1) The original was produced on more than one occasion. It was for the last time produced as the Hon'ble President of the Special Committee is fully aware, in the dispute in 1894 and was not returned to the Counter-Petitioner. It is no fault of the Counter-Petitioner if the Sannad is not now found among the papers on the Agra Thirtha question.

(2) That the grantees of the Sannad has been enjoying the first honor is clear from the fact that the Parakala Matt came in to interfere with this enjoyment in 1814 (Vide Ex. 7) and also from the circumstantial evidence that the Anandam Pillays have been the recepients of this honor in the neighbouring temples of Mandya, Ramanujapuram, Honnalagere, Mani-Karnik, etc from

A copy of Special Nirup of 1819 was produced Amildar of Closepet on 24.5.1874 by Anandam Pillay Sringriengar deposed at the same time that before Sri P Matt's Gumasta ~~T. Tirumalachar~~ T. Tatachiar was appointed in 1864, the Embars were getting the first Thirtha. The original of the Nirup was produced by Veerambudhi Sreenivasaiengar shortly afterwards. The Taluk and District authorities who dealt with it in the year 1876-79, erroneously construed permits contents that it conceded the first Agra Thirtha honors to Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhies; and the then

This is also an important document. It is likewise a false Sannad for much the same reasons as those stated in reference to Ex. 9 and for the following additional reasons:—

(1) Though the original of Ex. 10 is said to have been produced for the first time in 1874 or 1875, the original is not produced in this case and the Committee are thus deprived of the opportunity of testing its genuineness or falsity by the application of the usual methods

(2) That the grantees of this Sannad has enjoyed the first honors prior to 1811 as stated in it has not been proved

3) That the Sannad was ever

The most material question for consideration in the case is the genuineness of the General and Special Sannads of 1819 (Exbts 9 and 10) which, if true, neutralise the directions contained in Ex. B. × ×

× × × ×

× × × ×

The Special Sannad of the same date (Ex. 10) is addressed to the Amildar Seshagiraiya of Chennapatna and after referring to the General Sannad states that Anandam Pillay Sringriengar, and Veerambudhi Sreenivasiengar were from time immemorial getting Agra Thortha etc., and that their Mamul rights should be continued.

These documents were never referred to in any of the proceedings prior to 1874 × × ×

[illegible]

time immemorial. (3) As already stated this Nirup has all along been in full force, except for some time between the years 1864 and 1867 when Tirumalai Jatachar was unjustly forced on behalf of the Matt through the favouritism and collution of the Amildars Sreenivasa Rao and Narahari Rao, with the Matt.

Amildar issued orders accordingly

x x

x x x

In the Special Nirup it is directed that Anandan Pillay Sringriengar and Veerambudhi Sreenivasiengar shall receive Mirtha etc, subject to local usage. Granting that these (Exhibits 9 and 10) Nirups are genuine, it will be seen that the Ruling Sovereign who issued them was very considerate in so wording them. Because he must have known that the local usage in various temples must be different, depending on the rank and position of the several Acharyapurushas residing in various localities. Accordingly eted upon has not been proved. The oral and documentary evidence referred to in the earlier part of this argument clearly shows that the grantees of this Sannad did not enjoy first honors, that Anandam Pillay people shared the second ~ honors with Nallan Chakravarthi people, and that Veerambudhi people enjoyed the third honors because they were the hereditary Parpathegars of the Malur temple and as such were given the third ~ honor as representing the Maharaja Vide Exhibits. Z, BB, DD, EE, FF, GG, OO, RR in particular.

In the course of the enquiry in 1866 and 1875 ~ members of the families of the grantees of this Sannad themselves have admitted this fact The

× × ×

The Special Sannad, Ex. 10, is not now forthcoming. There is a record to show that it was produced and taken back in 1889, but the 1st Counter Petitioner is unable to say what has become of it. This document is addressed to Amildar Sesha~~giraiya~~ giri Rao by name but from the Thakaddama and Vasul Baki Accounts of the Taluk it is clearly made out that Seshagiri Rao ~ ceased to be Amildar some months before, ie, on 19-4-1819 and that Koniah was Amildar and has drawn pay. These accounts are voluminous though not in book form and quite above suspicion. The Muzrai Under-Secretary has also come in the Sha Anal Somae in one.

[illegible]

the time.

usage in the temples of Mallur etc., in the Channapatna Taluk was being observed upto 8th February 1906, by giving the first Agra Thirtha to the Embars in virtue of their possession in Guruparampa and the 2nd Agra Thirtha to Anandu Pillays and Nallan Chakravarthis jointly and the third Agra Thirtha to Veerambudhies. It is not laid down in the Special Nirupa Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhi shall receive the first Agrathirtha etc. It is simply stated in it that Thirtha etc., shall be given to him subject to local usage. Therefore it is conclusively clear oral evidence in this Case supports the same conclusion.

(4) Ex. 10 purports to have been addressed to Amildar Seshgiriaya. That Amildar Seshagiraiya was not the Amildar of Channapatna from more than 6 months before the date of this Sannad and for a long time after the date of this Sannad but that Koniah was the Amildar, will be clear upon a perusal of Exhibits A_1 to A_5 and Ex. H. and the Thakaddama Pattis which form the basis of Ex H.

(5) If this Sannad were genuine Veerambudhi Sreenivasiengar, the grantee of this Sannad, who was himself the Parpathegar of the Malur temple in 1821 would not have kept quiet

Huzur orders (Exbs. GGG to SSS) to the Amildar Koniah by name from which it is evident that not only was Seshagiri Rao not Amildar of Channapatna on the date of the Sannad, but that the Palace Huzur could not have been ignorant of the fact. It was at first stated that there was no entry in the Sha Amal of the issue of these Sannads (Vide Ex. F. F F.) but on 12.10.1909 the first Counter-Petitioner produced an extract in Maharatti of the Sha Amal (Ex 27) to the effect that a Nirup similar in terms was ~~w.~~ issued to the Fouzdar of Channapatna.

Considering the late stage at which it has been produced and the fact that it is

[illegible]
[illegible] 31 [illegible]
[illegible] 1819 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible].
[illegible]
[illegible]

That they are entitled to the first agra and that they received the same before the 8th Feby. 1906, on which date they wrongfully obtained them as will be shown below

issued to. He did not protest and the Anandam Pillays through the terms of Ex. Z. were in voilent opposition to their claims.

(6). While the Kadambis or (through them) the Embars were admittedly enjoying the first honors in the Mallur temple either as the Agents of the Parakala Matt or in their own personal right, neither of the grantees of this Sannad objected but quietly acquieced.

(7) In 1864, when the question of of the Matt's Gurumata prominently arose, this Sannad was neither produced nor relied on until about 1874. the Anandam

was rather out of the way to issue two orders on such a subject, one to the Fouzdar and another to the Amildar. I am not prepared to attach any credit to this extract. The original Sha Amal itself has to be carefully scrutinized to ascertain the genuineness of the entry. Moreover, the detailed contents of Ex 10 make it rather improbable that it should have issued from the Huzur. The fact that the autograph writing and signature of His Highness Krishnaraj Wodeyar in these two Sannads is apparently natural and genuine cannot count for much as it is notorious that such writing has been very successfully

Pillays and Veerambudris notwithstanding the latter were the Parpathecars of the temple, took no steps to oppose the continuance of a practice diametrically militating against the clear terms of the Sannad alleged to have been granted in their favour so far back as 1819, which Sannad is stated to have all along been in their possession.

(8) If this Sannad were genuine the Taluk and the temple at Meallur would have received the Sannad, would not have failed to act up to its terms, and would not have countenanced a practice in material opposition to its terms.

(9) In the Rama Giri Temple, the Counter-Petitioner

imitated in numerous documents. In such circumstances we must judge more by considerations as to the respectability of the custody from which it is produced, whether the custody is reasonable under the circumstances, whether they were produced at the earliest opportunity and whether there is satisfactory evidence of their having ever been acted upon. In the case of these two documents all these facts of corroboration are absent as explained below. There is nothing to indicate as to the person to whose custody the General Sannad was issued or who was entitled to retain it. The original of the second document has not been progetting the Petitioner's proves Parakala Matt's as ~~has~~ have been them. Mr. Venkata-ar who in 874 held the ~ to be genuine without any proper enquiry and who was anxious to ail the Parakala Matt's rights has been ~ obliged as a witness in this case for Endbar Krishnamachar to admit that from his personal knowledge and enquiry, he was satisfied that neither the ~ Anandam Pillays nor the Veerambudhies were enjoyed the first honors of the Malem Temple.

(11) The Nirup or Rahadari, ie, the Circular

of these documents were referred to in the enquiry of 1864 either by the ancestors of the 1st and 2nd ~ Counter Petitioners or the Servants of the temple though a descendant of Veerambudhi ~ Sreenivasiengar was a hereditary Parpathegar of the Malur Temple and was entitled to Thirtha honors.

aharaja of 20th
1831.
Ex. V. Clearly
that Exbts.
and 10 are neither
genuine nor operative

2). Ex (W) of 1838
and (X) of 1856
also prove the
falsity of Exbs. 9
and 10. In Ex (X) the
Maharaja mentions
two circular
orders as having
been granted
by him in favor
of the Parakala
Swami in respect
of the honors payable to the Matt.
These circular
orders are Exs.
B and V and Exbts.
9 and 10 as contended by the Counter-Petitioner. The
tenor of Ex (X)
very explicitly
shows the correctness of the
Petitioner's
Contention and the
incorrectness of the Counter petitioner's contention

13) It is a
remarkable
feature in the

case that the Counter-Petitioner and the Virambudhi people waited until after the ~~demise~~ demise of Krishna-Raja Wadeyar, III, in 1868, allowed their alleged rights to be incompletely ignored and openly enjoyed by the Matt's Gumastas and by the Embars until about 1874 and then manufactured this spurious Sannads Exs. 9 and 10 and launched the present litigation. If they had done so during the life time of Krishnaraja Wadeyar, III, H. H. would promptly have denounced the Sannads as forgeries in the same way as he had done on the several occasions on which forged Sannads purporting to have been

granted by H. H.
has been produced
prior to 1868.

I have also to add below some remarks of my own.

M_1 34. From the moment I received Ex. F. (list, based upon the Thakaddama Accounts, shewing the names of the Amildars of Channapatna from 1st. July 1810 to 30th. June 1837) from the Vernacular Records and found that there was some foundation for the allegation of the Matt that Seshagiraiya to whom Ex. 10 purports to be addressed was not then the Amildar of Channapatna, I wanted to thoroughly sift the matter as far as possible. I, therefore, wanted to get the records relating to the appeal of 1872 of the Anandam Pillays and Veeramoudhis against the order of 1864 to see if that contained any reference to Exbs. 9 and 10 or either. Similarly I wanted to obtain the records relating to Agra Thirtha in Maddur temples (Exbs. K and L) and the records relating to Agra Thirtha in Kalale temple (Vide unauthenticated copy of a judgment in Kalale case found in the Mallur file) to see if there would be any reference therein to Ex. 9 - the General Sannad of 1819. Unfortunately the Deputy Commissioners have written that none of these records is available. Even if they had been available and I should have suggested any inferences from non-reference in those records to these documents I would, perhaps, have been met by the arguments now urged by Anandam Pillay Appraneya Iyengar as regards the Magadi judgment Viz., that the Plaintiffs in that case filed only the particular Sannads &c., in their favour.

K_2 + L_2

J_2

M_1, O_1, Q_1

35. When after the close of the cases on 12th. October

Serial No.

H1 ✓

12th. October 1909 Anandam Pillay Appra.eya Iyengar sprung upon the Committee and the Matt Ex. 27 which purports to be a Sha Amal copy of the order issued to the Fouzdar of Bangalore in terms of Exbs. 9 and 10 and thus gave a rude shock to the idea till then implanted in the minds of all that as stated in Ex. F.F.F., there was no reference to these in the Sha Amal I was desired by the President of the Committee to get the Sha Amals of a few months and scrutinize them and show the Maharathi entries to Mr. D. Shama Rao one of the members for his opinion. My requisition for the Sha Amal papers was only tardily complied with.

Page 14 of Ex. W

36. Upon looking into these Sha Amal records I came across a number of entries of orders issued about the date of Ex. 10 to Amildar Koniah of Channapatna. These have been marked Exbs. G.G.G. to S.S.S. Mr. D. Shama Rao carefully examined the Maharatti entries and has in his note (Appendix 1a) recorded the opinion that the entry corresponding to Ex. 27 appears to be a recent introduction into Sha Amal. He is also of opinion, though he has not recorded it, that the entries corresponding to Ex. V. in this case and Ex. K in the Yethiraja Matt case are interpolations. This view is accepted by the Committee.

F2 ✓
(Pages 51-54 of [illegible])

37. Thus not only has plain evidence been found for condemning Ex. 10 which purports to be addressed to Amildar Seshagiraiya but it has also been revealed that everything is not as it should be in the Vernacular Records Branch of the Secretariat

The

Serial No.

The finding that Ex. V is false would mean that the Matt which obtained an unauthenticated copy thereof in 1907 is the first sinner in the matter of tempting the Vernacular Records and that its opponents followed suit.

58. With regard to the Sha Amal the Chief Court in Appeal No. 63 of 1889 have stated thus;-

R1

" X X X X

We felt considerable doubts as to the ---- genuineness of the Nirup referred to in the said order. We therefore wrote to Government and asked if there was any correspondence or register to show that the Nirup was actually issued to the Taluk. In reply Government informed us that no entry of the Nirup (was) to be found in the diary of the Huzur Nirup for June 1830 or in the Rozanama of the Dewan's Cutcherry for that year.

" This reply confirms our suspicions that the Nirup is not a genuine document."

It is unfortunate that with regard to such important records there should be reason to say that things are not all right. The Committee not being concerned with questions of office discipline have said nothing about this matter in their report.

59. Coming now to the documents of secondary importance, with regard to the depositions of 1864 Ex. B.B. it is hinted that they are not genuine as they end abruptly and are not authenticated by the then Amildar (Vide printed arguments of Anadam Pillay Appraneya Iyengar and Amildar Mr. Setlur Tirumala Charlu's report Ex. D.D.). It will

F1

R1

M2

however, be seen that Amcar Krishnama Char, one of the claimants now examined by the Committee clearly remembers the proceedings of 1864 and identifies the signatures of his father Sriranga Char, his agnate Govinda Char and Anandam Pillay Tirumala Char to the depositions then recorded. There can be no doubt, as held by the Committee, that Ex. B.B. is genuine.

D1 ✓
x (Page 90 of printed book)
N2 ✓
R1 ✓

40. As regards Koniah's letter, I have only to refer to my note (Appendix 9) and to my remark in the list of documents (6b) for reasons to hold that its genuineness has been most satisfactorily proved. The statement in the printed arguments of Anandam Pillay Appramenya Iyengar that this has been produced to prove the enjoyment of Thirtha by the Matt Gumasta is due to misapprehension. It is intended to prove, and proves, that in 1821 Koniah said that Anandam Pilays had to get Thirtha simultaneously with Nallan Chakravarthis after the Kadambis. Were Exbs. 9 and 10 genuine, he would not have issued an order contravening the directions of His Highness the Maharaja. The allegation in the same arguments that the order was not --- issued to the temple and acted upon cannot also be passed unchallenged. The order was communicated to the temple, a copy as directed therein was retained in the temple records and this copy was produced by the Temple Shanbhogue before the Amildar.

41. Exhibits V and 27 have been disposed of in paras 35 to 36 above. I must here say that if, as held

Serial No.

held by the Committee both Exbs. 9 and V are spurious it will be difficult to say which the two occasions referred to in His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar's letter of 1856 to Sir Mark Cubbon are (Ex x). One, of course, is 1811 when Ex. B. or a similar Sannad was issued in favor of the Parkala Matt.

From the arguments of Anandam Pillay Appaiameya Iyengar about V, I understand that he concedes its genuineness. His explanation for the issue thereof has an air of probability about it. My remarks against this document in (Appendix 6b) were written under the impression that the Committee would hold it to be genuine.

G7/ ✓

x ✓

42. As regards the Patti of Kudhirodgari x (1804) which says that Embars get in place of Kadambis, I have in my note (Appendix x 9) said that it is genuine ; and this view has been accepted by the Committee. Later on after a consideration of the entire evidence it appeared to me difficult to say that it was of the year 1804 inasmuch as if it were of that year Koniah in 1821 would not have referred to the Kadambis. This point has also been noted by the Committee.

43. The Committee have dealt in paragraphs 51-54 about the genuineness of some other documents. I do not think these are in any way useful for this case.

44. The finding of the Committee is given in para 54 of their report which runs thus :-

" The finding as to actual practice in the Mallur temple

Serial No.

temple therefore is that after the issue of the Nirup of 1811, the Matt had gumastas for receiving the Agra Thirtha, that it must be presumed to have so received the honors for many years until 10 or 15 years prior to 1864 when the Embars appear to have commenced to receive the honors and that in 1864 the Matt's claim was again revived and admitted for some years until about 1872 or so, when on the complaint of Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhi Srinivasa Iyengar the right was objected to on the strength of the Sannads of 1819 which have been held to be not genuine.

" It follows from this finding that the Matt's rights to receive Agra Thirtha honors by its Gumastas in the Mallur temple must be affirmed.

" as regards the relative right of priority as between the Embars and the Anandam Pillays, the evidence is over-whelming that whether as successors to the Kadambi people or as agent to Parakala Matt first and afterwards in their own right or by local influence or special merit of some members of the family, the Embars have been enjoying precedence over Anandam Pillays. In this connection I would accept the statements made by parties in 1864 as the most unprejudiced and straight-forward. For a few years after 1864 the Embars appear to have given up attending the Temple when the Anandam Pillay got the Thirtha honors next after the Matt Gumasta, but this defect is cured by the subsequent conduct of the Anandam

Pillay

Anandam Pillay and Veerambudhi parties in 1874 and as a direct result of the finding against the genuineness of the Special Sunnad of 1819, it follows that the next Thirtha, after the Matt is served, should go to the Umbars and that Anandan Pillay and Nallan Chakravarthi should have Thirtha honors simultaneously and that the Veerambudhi should come fourth."

45. Before I proceed to the next case I may be permitted to refer to one other matter connected with the Mallur case and this is whether the present proceedings are to be regarded as a continuation of the proceedings of 1864 or of the proceedings of 1874. If the starting point be the year 1864 we have to see what the state of things was before then. If it be 1874 we have to see what the state of things was before that year. It will be clear that the state of things prior to 1864 is not quite favourable to the Matt ; while the recognition of the Matt's right in 1864 and the enjoyment of Agra Thirtha by its Gumasta till 1872 makes the state of things prior to 1874 decidedly favourable to the Matt. Thus it is a material question which the starting point should be.

46. It is true that till 1872 the Counter-petitioners took no steps to contest the Amildar's order of 1864 in favour of the Matt. A similar delay may be urged against the Matt also as they took no steps till 188[illegible] to contest the order of 187[illegible] of the Deputy Commissioner or Muzrai Officer of Bangalore District. Thus on the whole it may be

said

said not to be unfair to regard the present proceedings as a continuation of the proceedings of 1864. The question for decision would thus be :-

Is it right or necessary to revive a privilege which the Matt have been found not to have enjoyed for 10 or 15 years prior to 1864 - the year in which the application was made ?

47. It has already been noted in para 26 above that in 1864 when the Ambars were getting the first Thirtha, Ambar Krishnama Char now conceded the Matt's right to enjoy Agra Thirtha by proxy ; and the document upon which the Anandam Pillays base their claim have been found to be spurious. Thus upon the principle enunciated in the Rangasthala× case which has now been followed by the Committee in connection with the Kadaba case, the Matt's right in the Mallur Temple may be upheld.

72 ✓

Yethiraja Matt case.

48. The case of the Yethiraja Matt dealt with by the Committee in paras 8 to 54 of their report is essentially simple enough. It is thus summarized by the Matt Advocate at page 22 of the printed× arguments :-

(Page 22-384 printed arg).

51 ✓

" The dispute about the Agra Thirtha Maryada may be said to begin almost from the time that His Highness Sri Krishna Raja Wodeyar, III, actuated by a praiseworthy devotion to his guru, issued about the year 1811 a Nirup granting Agra Thirtha honors to Sri Ghantavatara Parakala Swami in all the Vishnu Temples of the State.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

State. This Nirup does not appear to have been enforced in Melkote till the said Swami came to live there. Some time before 1829 the Swami attempted to secure the above honor to his gumasta in his absence. This naturally evoked resentment, and the injustice of the attempt came to the notice of His Highness when he visited the temple in person in 1829 ; and the result was the Ranga Mantapa proclamation (Ex. J).

G2 ✓

" About the year 1851, when it became known that Sri Ghantavatara Parakala Swami proposed leaving Melkote for good, the Yethiraja Matt, which, although it possessed better claims to Agra Thirtha honors, had till then refrained from appealing to His Highness from a natural sense of delicacy, now represented its case ; and His Highness was pleased to issue the Nirup of 1851. From about the time up to the year 1856, the Yethiraja matt was in undisturbed enjoyment of the honors."

49. It is for the Yethiraja Matt to prove the genuineness of the Sannad and also to prove that it was given effect to. For the purpose of this case, we have only to see whether the Yethiraja matt has proved these.

50. The question of the antiquity of the Matts is foreign to the issues in this case. The Committee also thought similarly and did not enter into any evidence on this question. They have, however recorded certain findings on this question also based upon the available evidence in the case. These findings though not necessary for ~~th~~

this

this case are useful for consideration in connection with the application of the Parakala Matt for a review of Government Order No. 577-96 L/ 20th April 1906 (Ex. [illegible]). The consideration of that application has been postponed by Government pending the receipt of the Committee's report in this case.

H2

51. It is of course not possible at this distance of time to establish by direct evidence the genuineness of the Sannad. To produce a copy of the Sha Amal, to prove that the Sannad itself was given effect to, and to produce it from proper custody at the earliest opportunity seem to be the only means by which the genuineness of the Sannad can now be established.

52. The Yethiraja Matt produced at a very late stage when the case had been closed after hearing the documents - a document purporting to be an extract from the Sha Amal of this Sannad. The Committee being of opinion that this extract cannot be genuine attached no value to it and have not at all referred thereto in their report. ~~this~~ This extract appears to be an interpolation into the Sha Amal.

J1

53. Before proceeding further it would be convenient to give a description of the Swamis of the Yethiraja Matt. The several Swamis are described below :-

P.T.O.

Name of Swami	Name in Purvasrama and description
(1) Sampatti Kumara Swamigalu	Mr. M. T. Narasiengar's great grand
(2) Yedugiri Narayana Swami	Thittuvël Sama Iyengar
(3) Yedugiri Ramanuja Swami	Kuppaiengar
(4) Yethiraja Sampatti Kumara Swami	Varada Char No Sw
(5) Narayana Jeeyar	Venkata Char, uncle of Advocate Char
(6)	Kumara Singla Char
(7) Sampatti Kumara Ramanuja Muni	[illegible] Algsingra Char, brother of Pandit Anandalwar, a friend of Sri Srinivasa Swami of Parakala Matt.
(8) Tirunarayana Perumal	Tirunarayana Iyengar, brother of Sampatti Kumara Ramanuja Muni
(9)	Jeer Sannidhi Vadhyar, father-in-law of Jogi Parthasarathi Iyengar.
(10)	Kumara Singla Char, father of Advocate Alasingra Char
(11)	Alasingra Char, father of Rai Saheb Srinivasiengar, Ex. Engineer, Madras Presidency

Period during which he was Swami	Remarks.
1832-39.	
1839-50.	
1850-58	
	Became Swami during life-time of his predecessor and went and settled at Rewa in N. India—where he lived for about 125 years or so
6 or 7 years.	
1865-74.	
1874-76	This is the Swami that agitated for Agra Thirtha and got an order in 1874 in his favor from the Muzrai officer of Hassan Dt., Mr. A Srinivasa Iyengar father of Mr. A. Govindacharya.
1876-86	This Swami is the author of Sanskrit Nyayamanappadi.
1886-87.	
1887-1901	
1901-07	
1908.	

$u_1 + v_1$

w_1

54. The chief documents in this case, Sannads A and B, Niyamanapadi &c., were first produced in 1907. These were not produced in 1874 when one of the Swamies agitated for Agra Thirtha ; nor were they produced in 1881 when one Singla Char - apparently an Agent of this Matt - applied to Govern-ment for honors to this Matt. These omissions are most significant. It is alleged in the printed arguments of the Yetniraja Matt that copies of Exbs. A and B were despatched to the Dewan in July 1890-91. But this has not been proved. If really these were available then, it is not clear why Agra Thirtha was not claimed at once. Sixth witness for Petitioner says that he saw Ex. A before signing the petition in 1895 about Alankara. But the copy of this petition produced and marked Ex. D refers to a Sannad of Chicka Devaraja Wodeyar and not of Kantirava Narasaraja Wodeyar.

x_1

55. It is explained that these documents were not produced because they were in the possession of Swami Varada Char who went away to Rewa ; but as observed by the Committee in Para 52 of their report " no suggestion of differences between the two (Kuppaniengar and Varada Char) has been hinted at and the petition of Swami Kuppaniengar requesting that the stipend &c., might be paid till Swami Varada Char returned from the North, to the latter's brother and another, negatives all such presumption.

m

56. The Matt or its agent might have directly produced these documents and boldly asserted the

Matt's

Matt's right. It has, however, taken a round about course of getting these produced by people styling themselves to be ~~met~~ Matt disciples. So, it is said that the documents have not come from proper custody.

57. It must also be remembered that the Junior Parakalaswami lived at Melkote till 1856 that there was thus no necessity for a Parakala Matt Gumasta in 1851 and so no necessity for the Sanad Ex. B.

Y1

58. It is also not easy to prove now that this Sannad was given effect to between 1851 and 1856. It is practically admitted that subsequent to 1858, Yethiraja Matt Swamies did not, except for a short period in accordance with Mr. K. Srinivas Iyengar's order of 1874 which, however, was set aside, enjoy Agra Thirtha. Of the witnesses examined by the Yethiraja Matt only one is old enough to speak of the period prior to 1850. He says that the Swami Kuppaniengar was getting Agra Thirtha. The Parakala Matt offered to examine witnesses to disprove this but the Committee dispensed with such evidence.

Y1

59. This enjoyment of the right by Kuppaniengar does not appear to have been referred to in the proceedings of 1874 for the order of that year (Ex. 53) is based upon an alleged practice of setting apart Thirtha in a cup for the Parakala Matt and distributing the remainder to those present.

60. Thus, the Yethiraja Matt has either

proved

proved the genuineness of the Sannad (Ex B) nor that it has been given effect to. It would thus follow that the claim of the Yethiraja Swami to Agra Thirtha in preference to the Parakala Matt Gumasta should be dismissed ; but there is the re-×commendation of Mr. Ramaiya one of the members of the Committee to the effect that a Grihasta should not have preference over a Yati. This is the only point on which there is a difference of opinion among the members of the Committee.

Z1 ✓

As regards this recommendation, the other members of the Committee say as follows :-

F2 ✓
Page 53 of printed book)

× (Mr D Shama Rao's opinion)

" There is not much force in the argument that a Yati should not be made to receive the Thirtha after a Gumasta, as it is not the Gumasta in his individual capacity that receives the Thirtha first but the Matt or other persons whom he represents. If the Yati considers it derogatory to receive the Thirtha after the Gumasta, he may avoid being present there at the time. Respectable witnesses have deposed to the fact that in some important temples in the Madras Presidency Hakdar Grihastas receive Thirtha before Yatis. This question was taken to Courts of Law so early as in 1840 and it was decided that the Swami of the Ahobila Matt could not, even in his own Matt, have precedence over the plaintiffs in the suit in the matter of receiving Agra Thirtha through their Gumasta."

M ✓
[illegible] of printed book)

Mr A Rangasami Iyengar's opinion (Para 4 of report)

" It is argued on abstract considerations that it would be derogatory to a Yati to receive the

the

the Thirtha after the hakdar or his gumasta is served and that a yati is entitled to special consideration by the mere fact of his having renounced the world especially as the hakdar or his gumasta might often be a man of inferior merit.

" It is desirable in this connection to consider the nature and effect of the Agra Thirtha honors and on what occasions they are given. These honors are generally paid only after [illegible] at the time of the daily worship of the idols or on occasions of festivals or when the idols are taken to places in Mantapam or [illegible] The idea is that the God is served first and then by his command the Acharyapurushas or persons entitled to special honors are called by Arulappadu and presented with the Thirtha and other Prasada of the God. This cannot apply to the chance visitors of the temple as explained by some of the witnesses and the judgment of the Principal Sadar Amin in the [illegible] case. The payment of these honors to individuals by reason of a right or [illegible] cannot amount to any disrespect to others although of higher standing who could come at other times and receive special honors which their status may entitle them."

This opinion is amply supported by the evidence of the witnesses from [illegible] India.

52. I may also refer to my note in the [illegible] Agra Thirtha file ([illegible] also today for orders) to the effect that the [illegible] Swami told me that if he himself went to [illegible] and

Such

such places he would have to go to temple after Sattumarai so that he might have Thirtha first.

63. Thus, Mr. Ramaiya's recommendation - though natural and on the face of it sound - is opposed to practice every-where. So, the claim of the Yethiraja Mutt has to be rejected.

Suggestions.

M ✓
(Pages 48 & 49 of printed book).

The Committee in paras 61 to 64 of their report recommend, as suggestions for the future, that the present system of recognising Thirtha haks and grihastas may be continued. They add that, to prevent the abuse of the grihasta system, it may be laid down that the person appointed should be of good family, that he should have some knowledge of Veda and Prabandha and that ~~the~~ he should not be a man of bad character and that where the fitness of a grihasta is questioned the decision of the Muzrai Officer about the fitness or otherwise should be final. They further add that, in order that hakdars may not be inconvennienced owing to the difficulty in procuring proper men, it may be laid down that the Thirtha honors should be kept in abeyance where proper grihastas are not available and that non-enjoyment in such cases should not be held to extinguish the right. Mr. Ramaiya while agreeing with these suggestions is of opinion that in no circumstances should a grihasta be raised to the precedence over a Jati (to whatever sect the latter may belong). It is a question if the first suggestion, viz., that the Thirtha honors should be kept in abeyance

where

where proper gumastas are not available - is not at variance with the ratio decidendi in the Malekal -Tirupati and Banavar cases, Viz., that in a temple where the Sannad of 1811 has never been enforced it cannot be enforced now. The Matt in this case has said that they had no gumasta as fit persons were not available. If the suggestion is adopted it seems to me that the door will be opened for a number of new claims by the Matt in disturbance of existing conditions.

See under disposal.
page 239 (printed book)—

65. The matters in dispute having been thus disposed of I have now to deal with the Committee's recommendation for bonuses. The clerks referred to have worked out of office-hours in connection with this case, i.e., have attended to this case in addition to their ordinary work. They well deserve, as I can personally testify, the bonuses recommended. In addition to the clerks referred to by the Committee I have taken extra work from another clerk of my office, A. Nanjappa, who may be given a bonus of Rs. 15/-. If the recommendation is approved a source from which this entire amount of bonuses recommended, may be met will be looked for.

Submitted to Dewan through
Secy. Committee

Under-Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

30 March 1911.

The claim of the Sri Parakala Matha was definitely rejected on various grounds by the G.O. of 15 March 1895, and Govt. refused to reconsider it by an order passed in Ap 1899. However on repeated representations of the Matha, the matter was ordered to be reopened at the close of 1902 on the recommendation of the Dewan. Seeing the emphatic manner in which the genuineness of the Sannads of 31 Oct 1819 and 28 Oct 1829 were asserted in the G.O of 1905, it is perhaps doubtful whether it would not have been better to decline to reopen the case.

As however the case has been reinvestigated in

Serial No.

an elaborate manner, and an unanimous report has been submitted impugning the genuineness of these documents, I think that the findings of the Committee on the character of the various important documents involved in the case may be accepted by Govt.

The sannad of 1811 is the basis of the Matha's claim of Agra tirtha. That H H the Swami personally ~~ca~~ is entitled to the honour has not been denied. The dispute is whether his gumastas should be likewise honoured. The words referring to this in the nirupa are [illegible] .... [illegible]

Note—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

+?

[illegible]
[illegible]
([illegible]) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]. Whether this direction was meant to be carried out in respect of the successors of the Swami named, and whether it was meant to apply to all Sumastas, is by no means certain, if we restrict ourselves to a consideration of the words alone. But the doct ~~it~~ has been ~~so~~ all along interpreted in this sense, and so may accept the wide interpretation placed upon

In 1895 Govt
to give the privilege ~~it~~ a wider
than in temples where it

had been actively enjoyed by the Matha. The Committee recommends the same restriction and we may accept it.

In the Kadaba Case, the recommendation made is virtually a compromise as stated in the Under Secretary's Note. It seems to me that this is to be accounted for by their uncertainty about the character of the ~~Nir~~ Nirup of 1829. But as stated by the U.S. I think this ~~[illegible]~~ Nirup should be held to be not proved. At the same time, there is a reasonable doubt about the enjoyment of the honours by the Gumasta of the Matha. What the Committee recommend is virtually setting up a permanent agency despite the wish and conduct of the Principal. This is likely to satisfy neither party and would at best be a clumsy makeshift. ~~But it is difficult~~ Perhaps it would be better to hold that the Matha has not satisfactorily proved enjoyment in this case also.

In the Malur case, the Committees ~~result~~ finding (affirming Matha's claim) shd be affirmed.

The same is ~~to~~ to be said of the findings in the Yatiraja Matha case.

As regards the ~~claim~~ argument that a grihastha agent cannot be given precedence over a yati, the suggestion that it would be enough ~~to se~~ for the latter not to go at the particular time when these honours have to be ~~chosen~~. paid, does not appear to be a satisfactory solution. However as the grant of honour is said to have been made by H.H. the Maharaja, it may be modified by the same authority. ~~If H.H. should like, it may perhaps~~ If it commends itself to H.H., a modifying order may be issued that when the Parakala Swami is away, ~~be~~ the yatis of ~~the Matha~~ recognised Mathas will be honoured before the gumasta of the Para Kala Matha; and except in this respect, all the honours claimed by ~~the Swami~~ H H the Swami may be given. I think ~~that~~ this would be a better alternative than trying to restrict the ~~descriptn~~ discretion of the firm in the matter of selecting a gumasta. He will have his own ~~to~~ prestige to guard, and is almost always likely to make as good a choice at least as ~~to a~~ any officer of Govt.

A draft on these lines may be prepared and submitted for approval.

another draft
~~clos~~ accepting
all the Committee's ~~sup~~
conclusions (except restrictions
about gumasta appointments)
may be prepared.

257./11

Note continued.

As directed above, I have put up a draft embodying also alternative views where-ever necessary.

I further beg permission to respect-fully suggest a reconsideration of the Second Councillor's views about the Kadaba case and about Agra Thirtha to Mathadhipathis.

A modification of the Sanad of 1[illegible] will, I submit, chiefly benefit the Yethirajaswami [illegible]. I shall for the present [illegible] the Vyasarayaswami [illegible] temple. No other Mathadhipathi in the Mysore Province is likely to visit a [illegible]. [illegible] Vaishnava Mathadhipathis of [illegible] will only be rare visitors and they are accustomed to the practice of Southern India where [illegible] are preferred to all others including [illegible].

Thus the modification will benefit the Yethirajaswami chiefly. It must be remembered that in this elaborate enquiry he has completely failed to prove his case. The dispute [illegible] Agra Thirtha [illegible] is a very old one and the Yethiraja Matt [illegible] would have [illegible] to [illegible] been [illegible]. [illegible] for the [illegible] ([illegible] to say that [illegible] be [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] prayer for the [illegible] to have [illegible] would be [illegible] for [illegible] enquiry. [illegible]

[illegible]

prove his case should succeed upon some [illegible] considerations appears to be [illegible].

If it is said that the Yethirajaswami [illegible] is not to be one of the heads of recognised Mutts then the modification will serve no purpose while causing acute dis-satisfaction to [illegible].

It will be seen [illegible] para 1 [illegible] Bahadur Mr. Srinivasa Charlu's note [illegible] His Highness the late Maharaja Sri [illegible] Wadeyar Bahadur expressed his willingness to recognize the rights of even [illegible] that His late Highness [illegible] to recognize the rights of [illegible] only. Even now, perhaps, Sri [illegible] be consulted; [illegible] between the [illegible] and Vadagalai [illegible] that [illegible] Swami consent to the Sri [illegible]. [illegible] Sri Parakalaswami's consent [illegible] matter of surprise [illegible] that his prestige will [illegible] quite [illegible].

[illegible]

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

92

consideration whether the order should be allowed to be vague or whether we are to specify the [illegible] individuals they are to be honoured. A list of [illegible] that is entitled to First Day's Bhiksha is put up. There can be no doubt that the Sri Sringeri Matt, Sri Uttaradi Matt, Sri Vyasaraya Matt, Sri Raghavendraswami Matt, Sri [illegible] Matt and Sri Vanamamalai Mutt have the status to claim first Thirtha. The Sri Yatirajaswami Matt as the chief or perhaps only Matt in the State of Tengalai Srivaishnavas may, I submit, also be given this status. The Sri [illegible] Matt and the Kudli Sringeri Matt may also be given this status.

As regards the [illegible] case, I would respectfully invite attention to the fact that prior to 1881 nobody appears to have been getting Agra Thirtha. The distinction between [illegible] and the Malekal-Tirupati case is that in the [illegible] the rights of others to Agra Thirtha are [illegible] and not in the former. If in the latter [illegible] that the Matt is to have no precedence there [illegible] uphold the right of the [illegible] family. A similar decision in the former case will uphold [illegible]'s right and the dispute about Agra Thirtha will commence afresh. An order on the lines recommended by the Committee will set matters at rest.

Resubmitted to Second Councillor.

29 June 1911. Under Secretary, Muzrai Dept.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

Submitted to First Councillor in accordance with the Dewan's oral orders. A Part of the records and the printed books is kept in the file.

The papers referred to in the note are flagged are ~~submitted~~ tied in a dafter cloth and ~~separate~~ submitted herewith.

~~If necessary~~ Three Sannads in original are also put up.

Any other original papers that may be called for will be submitted

17/7/54

Note—Contn sheet.

Serial No.

I must apologize for keeping the file so long - but the voluminous nature of the record and the little time I had at my disposal in consequence of the duties of Revenue Commissioner having devolved upon me must be held to account for the delay.

The report of the Committee is not a unanimous one. The President Mr Rungaswamy Iengar and one of the members Mr D Shama Rao are of one opinion, whereas the other member Mr H Ramiah is of a different opinion. The enquiry lasted for several years and covers the whole ground of Agra Tirtha known claimed by the Sri Parakala & the Sri Yatiraja Mutts.

In the Nirup of 1811 granted by H H the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur Tt

Serial No.

the privilege of Agra Thirtha honors was conferred upon the Guru of Parakala Mutt in all Vishnu Temples in Mysore - and it was further directed that the Brahmins appointed by the Parakala Mutt should also receive the first Thirtha & other Maryadas. Now it is a well known fact that a privilege of this kind is not restricted to the Guru in whose time it is granted but is granted in perpetuity to the Mutt itself and therefore enjoyed by the succeeding Gurus and their Gumastas. The usage in the Melkote temple is in accordance with this view. If the Parakala Mutt is entitled to the first honor, it follows as a matter of course that its local representative should receive that honor in behalf of the Mutt. The honor is one conferred upon the Mutt and not upon the individual, and the Mutt is entitled, as a matter of right to receive it. When the Guru is present in the Temple he will of course get the Agradhirtha honors, but when he is not so present, the Mutt does not forfeit its rights to the first honors - which are received in behalf of the Mutt by its local representative, who it must be presumed will be a competent person to be the recipient of such honors. This does not mean that the Gumasta is honored, but that the Mutt's honors are received by its Gumasta. In this view no disparagement of other yatis & Matadhipaties who may be present on the occasion is meant. The Sri Parakala Mutt receives the Agradhirtha and others follow. In this arrangement I can see no outrage on common sense or decency.

On marriage occasions it is usual with Hindus to hand over the first Thamboola to some layman representing the Mutt which is entitled to receive the first honor. altho' men of higher status & rank than the recipient may also be present on the occasion.

Both on abstract grounds and on the strength of evidence recorded by the Committee, not to speak of the practice now in vogue in important Vishnu Temples in Southern India I am of opinion that the right vested in the Sri Parakala Mutt has always been and may be exercised by its accredited local representative otherwise called Gumasta. It goes without saying that the latter should be a man of good family, & of some learning and should bear a good character -

Serial
No.

The above is the real point at issue and I agree with the opinion of the majority of the Committee that there is no need to make any change in the existing practice - The dispute between the Sri Parakala Mutt and the Sri Yatiraja Mutt at Melkote is really the recrudescence of the old dispute between the Vadagalay & the Thengalay and should not be encouraged in any way.

As regards the agratheertha honors in the Malur, Kadaba & Malakal Tirupati temples I am in agreement with the unanimous finding of the Committee.

KPN
7/2/12

15067
12-2-12

Submitted to Dewan

8/2/1912

Submitted to His Highness.

The right to Agra Tirtha in the marginally noted Vishnu temples, has long been the subject of contention between the Sri Parakala Matt and the local Acharayapurushas.

1. Sri Apprameyaswami temple at Mallur (in Taluk Channapatna).
2. Sri Ramadevaru temple at Kadaba (In Taluk Gubbi).
3. Sri Lakshminarasimhaswami temple at Bellatur (in Taluk Heggaddevankote).
4. Sri Venkataramanaswami temple at Malekal Tirupati and Sri Kesavaswami temple at Banavar, in the Arsikere Taluk.

S (in pri [illegible]

[illegible]

36 [illegible]

in [illegible]

U

2. In Government Proceedings No.C.42-45 dated 15th March 1895, it was held that the Sannad of 1811 on which the Matt base their claim, had been modified by that of 1819, and that it could be enforced in those particular Vishnu temples where it had been enforced without interruption and without question during a period sufficient to give the Matt or its representatives a prescriptive right to the privileges in question and that it could not be enforced where such enjoyment was wanting. The Government accordingly decided all the four cases in question unfavourably to the Matt. As already stated, this was in March 1895.

3. Against this decision, the Agent of the Parakala Matt submitted a memorial to Her Highness the Maharani-Regent in June 1895, praying for a reconsideration of the order, so far as it related to the Mallur, Kadaba and Malekal Tirupati and Banavar. The Bellatur case was stated to have been taken before the Regency in appeal separately.

Page 5 of the [illegible]

Nothing however was done and the Matt continued to press its case. Thereupon, the Government, with His Highness' sanction, resolved upon the appointment of a special Committee for the investigation of the claim and submission of definite findings (vide Government Order No.Muz.F.67-93 dated 14th March 1903).

Page 15 of [illegible]

4. Progress of work was somewhat hampered owing to the failure of the Matt authorities to produce the documents relied upon by them and subsequently owing to the necessity for reconstituting the Committee on the retirement of the President, Dewan Bahadur Mr. A. Ramachandra Iyer, and the resignation of some of the members.

5. The Committee was finally reconstituted by Government Order No.553-7 dated 8th January 1909 with Rajakaryapravina Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar as President

President and Messrs. D. Shama Rao and H. Ramaia as members.

6. In 1908, the Yethiraja Matt disciples claimed that their Guru had the right of Agra Tirtha &c., in the Melkote temple in preference to the Gumastas of Sri Parakalaswami, and this claim also was referred to the special Committee for consideration along with the other cases (vide Government Order No.5823-6 dated 29th June 1908).

Page 17 [illegible]

Page 18 -

7. Again, in July 1909, one Embar Krishnamachar of Mallur prayed for a recognition of his right to receive prior honors in the Sri Apprameyaswami and other temples at Mallur. This also was referred to the Committee for consideration (vide Government Order No.704 dated 6th September 1909).

Page 22

T.

8. The Committee as finally constituted have, after a full enquiry into the case, submitted an exhaustive report dealing with the questions referred to them. Their findings are recorded on pages 38, 46 and 47 of the printed volume herewith submitted. The Committee hold that in the Melkote and Mallur temples, the Sri Parakal

	Page.	Para.
Yethiraj Matt (Melkote temple)	38	34
Mallur case -	46	54
Kadaba " -	47	59
Malekal Tirupati case	47	60

Parakal Matt Gumasta is to have the Agra Tirtha in preference to others, that the next Thirtha after the Matt is served, in the Mallur temple, should go to the Embars; *that in the Kadaba (and Sampige) temple, the* honor shall vest in the Parakala Matt, to be paid to the second counter-petitioner (Venkata Narasimhachar) and his descendants as the Agent of the Parakal Matt; and that in the Malekal Tirupati and Banavar temples, the claim of the Matt is untenable. On one point there is a difference of opinion between the President and Mr. D. Shama Rao (member) and Mr. H. Ramaiya. The latter recommends that a Grihasta should not have preference over a Yati (to whatever sect he may belong), while the President and the other member consider that there is nothing derogatory about this (vide Mr. Ramaiya's minute of dissent - pages 54-57, and the opinions of Messrs. Rangaswami Iyengar and D. Shama Rao on pages 44 and 53).

9. The Committee also recommended, as suggestions for the future, that in order that the system of Gumastas may not be abused unduly, it may be provided that the person appointed as Gumasta should be of good family (Abhijata), that he should have some knowledge

of Veda and Prabhanda and that he should not be a man of bad character (page 49 para 64 of the report).

Pages 38 - 44
of office notes.

10. The present First Councillor, Mr. H.V.Nanjundayya, has in his notes dated 25th June 1911, discussed the various aspects of the case. He is of opinion that the Committee's findings in regard to the claim on behalf of the Yethiraja Swami for honors at Melkote and the claim of the Parakala Swami for honors at Mallur may be affirmed; while as regards the claim of the Parakala Swami for honors at Kadaba, he entertains doubts about the enjoyment of the honor by the Gumasta of the Matt, and considers that it would perhaps be better to hold that the Matt has not proved enjoyment. In regard to the argument that a Grihasta Agent cannot be given precedence over a Yati, the First Councillor (Mr. H.V. Nanjundayya) while considering the suggestion to be unsatisfactory that the Yati need not go at the particular time when these honors are paid, proceeds to state that if His Highness approves, a modifying order may be issued that when the Parakala Swami is not present, the Yatis of recognized Matts will be honored before the Gumasta of the Parakala Matt.

Pa. 49 -
of office notes.

11. The then First Councillor, Mr. K.P. Puttanna Chetty, is in agreement with the findings of the Com-

Committee as regards Mallur, Kadaba and Malekal Tirupati cases. Regarding the Yethiraj Matt (Melkote) case also, he agrees with the Committee that there is no need to make any change in the existing practice. He sees no disparagement in the Matt honors being received by its Gumasta.

G.

12. I am inclined to agree with Mr.H. Ramaia's note printed as Appendix 1b (pages 54 to 57). As observed by him, the document of 1811 is not a Sannad in the sense of a formal document, formally conferring and proclaiming honors, which the Sovereign alone is competent to bestow. The plain meaning of the document is that in the course of His Holiness the Parakala Swami's peregrinations, His Holiness the Swami and his staff should receive first honors. Every claim that has been advanced and which forms the subject of these ponderous proceedings, is a mere development suggested by a desire to acquire univers~~l~~al preferential treatment even where such did not exist.

13. In a case like this which has been dealt with by great authorities like Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer in 1895, and by the very able Committee, whose report is now under disposal, and by Councillors like Messrs.

Messrs. H.V.Nanjundayya and K.P. Puttanna Chetty, I feel considerable diffidence in holding or advancing any opinion which is not in accord with theirs, but I cannot help thinking that there is considerable triviality in the dispute under disposal, and that far too much is made of matters of small importance.

14. His Holiness the Sri Parakala Swami, as being the Rajaguru, is of course entitled to first honors, and Sannad or no Sannad, Mamool or no Mamool, he will receive the same in all assemblies and on all occasions in which he may be present.

15. The trouble comes when these honors have to be paid during his absence, and the question arises whether they should be paid and received vicariously or by proxy. The honors indeed are not transferable and may well cease to be paid when the honorable Guru is absent. But if a point should be strained in his favor, a common sense and practical solution of the question would be that those honors (which are really in the shape of offerings of flowers, Tirtha &c.) should be placed on a separate tray in the name of His Holiness the Parakala Swami before they are paid to the others assembled. I know not whether this is too civilized

and modern a procedure to command universal concurrence. But it has in its favour substantial common sense and justice to all persons entitled to respect.

16. With all deference to the high authorities who have pronounced on the subject, I may venture to point out that there is some unreality (and even absurdity) in discussing whether the Rajaguru is entitled (through proxy) to first respects at Kadaba while he is not entitled to them at Mallur, or to hold that he is entitled to them at Seringapatam and Melkote and not at Bellatur and Arsikere and Banavar, though the sanctity which attaches to the Rajaguru and which is the raison d'etre of all these claims, goes with him in all these places.

17. Under all these circumstances, it seems to me that if the course suggested at para 15 of this note be considered inexpedient, the Government Order of 15th March 1895 may be affirmed as it is desirable that there should be a finality in these matters and no good cause has been shown to re-open the question.

18. The recommendation of the Committee to the grant of small bonuses to the officials employed on the investigation of this case may be sanctioned.

P. Ananda Rao
17 June

18.6.12
320

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders
of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Claim of the Sri Parakala Matt for Agra Thirtha honours in the Vish temples in the State.

Order.

D. O. No. 1727

R. O. No. 22570

To Mr. 1 Members
2 Commit[illegible] with compliments
3.5.15.

W.S. Mr. [illegible] Re

Please go over the draft with the file again & make it conformable to this order (about 3 days)
7/5/15

[illegible] 7/5

1st May 1915.

Rec. 7/5/15

My dear Sir,

In returning the accompanying file about the Agra Thirtha honours claimed by the Sri Parakala Mutt, I am directed to say that His Highness approves intoto of the suggestions and recommendations made by the majority of the committee (viz. Messrs. Rangasami Iyengar and Desamukh Shama Rao) appointed in 1909 and desires that effect may kindly be given to them now.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

Mirza M. Ismail

M.Visvesvaraya Esq.,C.I.E.,

Dewan of Mysore,

Mysore.

Serial
No.

Subd. to 1st member

As directed the draft order has been revised and a typed copy is submitted for approval. As far as possible the wording of the Committee's finding has been adopted. The original manuscript draft on which the additions and corrections have been made in pencil is also put up to show where these have been made.

An alternative draft for the concluding paras 24 & 25 which are now retained as in the old draft is also submitted. In the new draft mention is also made of the A. Subordinate Accounts Services which was omitted in the previous one for the obvious reason that Mr. A. S. Livesey was responsible for it..

I am sorry I could not send up the file within the time limit. As a careful study of the report ~~[illegible]~~ was necessary and the typing also involved some time.

14.5.15

Draft appd

17/5/15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 191 .

Serial No.

Clean proof of the Govt. order subd. for approval.

~~Sd~~ 11/6.15.

The draft order is put in type and a proof is sent up for approval. It is a matter for consideration whether the draft should be submitted to His Highness before issue.

[illegible]
11. 6. 15

Secy)

His Highness has already approved of the Committee's views. Dewan
12/6

As this is a very important order, the draft is submitted to Dewan before issue.

Dewan)

[illegible]
12/6

2819
12-6-15

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—25 000—2 11 14

D. O. No. 3176/Ex on file

Bangalore,
7th August 1915

Mirza M. Ismail Esq.
Huzur Secretary

My dear Sir,

With reference to your D.O. letter No 1737 dated 1st May 1915 communicating His Highness' orders on the question of the Agra Tirtha honors, I send herewith the draft Government order (in proof), for favor of His Highness' approval. The draft has been scrutinized and approved by the First Member.

As the matter concerns the Sri Parakala Matt Mysore I have considered it desirable to send up the draft, before issue.

Yours sincerely

7.8.15. (Dewan)

C. O. No. Fr 2912

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

D.O. No 25
Encl : One File.

14th August 1915.

My dear Sir,

I am directed to return, duly approved by His Highness, the draft Government Order and other papers re Agra Tirtha honours forwarded with your D.O. letter No.3176 dated the 7th instant.

x
Put up herewith.
CSR
15-8-15.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,

14.8.15.

16/8/15

Sir M. Visvesvaraya, K.C.I.E.,
Dewan of Mysore,
Bangalore.

28/19|5-.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

READ:--

Government Proceedings No.C.42-5 dated 15th March 1895, passing orders on the claims of the Sri Parakala Matt to Agra Tirtha and other honours in certain Vishnu temples in the State.

2. Memorial dated 11th June 1895 from the Agent of the Sri Parakalaswami Matt praying for a review of the above orders.

3. Memorial Registered No.20/372 dated 6th October 1902 from the same praying for early disposal of his review memorial.

4. Government Proceedings No.1857-60/Muz.F.67-93 dated 14th March 1903, appointing a special committee to thoroughly examine all available evidence and submit definite proposals as to what should be done in the matter.

5. Government Proceedings No.E-I dated 17th October 1904, ordering certain alterations in the personnel of the Committee.

6. Government Proceedings No.553-7/Muz.F.78-08-5 dated 8th January 1909, ordering certain further alterations in the personnel of the Committee.

7. Petition Registered No.2971 dated 18th

20|8|15

January 1908 from A. Anandalwar and other disciples of the Sri Yatiraja Matt at Melkote urging that Agra Maryades in the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote should be shewn to the Yatiraja Swami in preference to the Sri Parakala~~swami~~ Matt's Gumasta.

8. Government Proceedings No.5823-6 dated 29th June 1908, referring the above petition to the special committee for consideration along with the other cases before it.

9. Memorial Registered No.134/91 dated 13th July 1909 from Embar Krishnamacharya to His Highness the Maharaja urging his claim to Agra Tirtha in the temple at Malur in preference to the members of the Anandam Pillay family.

10. Government Proceedings No.704/Muz. F.69-09-2 dated 6th September 1909, referring the memorial to the special committee for investigation, and

11. Letter No.A dated 31st March 1910, from the Special Committee, submitting a report on the matters referred to it for investigation.

ORDER THEREON: No. $\frac{531-46}{\text{Mz. } 69-09-4}$ Dt/19.8.1915

Under a Nirup purporting to have been issued by His Highness the late Sri Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur, III, on Monday the 13th day of Vaisakha Bahula of Prajotpatti corresponding to 20th May 1811, the

Sri Parakala Matt claims Agra Tirtha to its Gumasta in all Vishnu temples in the State in preference to all other devotees, be they Mathadipaties or others.

1. Sri Apprameyaswami temple at Malur.
2. Sri Ramadevaru temple at Kadaba and the temple at Sampige in the Gubbi Taluk.
3. Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami temple at Bellattur.
4. Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Malekal-Tirupati and Sri Kesava Swami temple at Banavar.

2. This right in the marginally noted temples having been disputed by the local Acharyapurushas, the matter came up before Government, who in the first of the orders read above held that the Nirups produced by the Acharyapurushas were genuine, that the Nirup of 1811, relied upon by the Matt could only be enforced in those particular Vishnu temples where it had been enforced without interruption and without question during a period sufficient to give the Matt or its representatives a prescriptive right to the privileges in question and not where such enjoyment was wanting and that the Nirup itself had been modified by one issued in 1819. They accordingly decided all the cases unfavourably to the Matt.

3. The Matt in a lengthy memorial presented by its Agent dated 11th June 1895 has prayed for a review of this order so far as it relates to the Malur, Kadaba and Malekal-Tirupati cases. It is urged that this Government Order is based upon an inadequate enquiry, and that the Matt was not given an opportunity to place before Government all the facts relating to the cases and the evidence in its favour. It is further urged that the Sannads produced by the Acharyapurushas in the Malur and Kadaba cases are not genuine and that

it is contrary to Sastras to give Agra Tirtha to a Smartha in Vishnu temples.

4. The Matha having repeatedly pressed its prayer for a review, the Government with a view to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of this long-standing complaint appointed a Committee (i) to take all the evidence in the case fully, (ii) to find as a matter of fact, after hearing the parties concerned, what are the genuine orders which have issued from time to time and the actual practice which has been in vogue, whether in accordance with ~~a~~ or contrary to those orders and (iii), to submit carefully considered suggestions as to what may be done in the future.

5. The Sri Yatirajaswami at Melkote through some of his disciples urged his right to Agra Tirtha for himself in the Melkote temple in preference to the Parakala Matt's Gumasta and this claim was also referred to the Committee for enquiry Similarly, the memorial of Embar Krishnamacharya for Agra Tirtha in the Sri Apprameyaswami temple at Malur, was also referred to the Committee who were asked to report, in the event of the memorialist not being found entitled to Agra Tirtha, whether he or the Anandam Pillay family were entitled to the next Tirtha.

6. From time to time the personnel of the Committee had for various reasons to be modified. The Committee finally consisting of ~~the marginally noted gentlemen~~

Rao Bahadur Raja Karya Prave~~e~~ina
Mr.A.Rangasami Iyengar,B.A.B.L. as
President.
Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Prasaktha
Mr. D. Shama Rao.
Mr. H. Ramaiyya. as Members.

have after fully enquiring into the cases submitted an exhaustive report.

7. The Committee look upon the case relating to the claim of the Swami of the Sri Yatiraja Matt as the most important on the ground that the issues raised therein are important and comprehensive and the findings thereon will throw much light on the points at issue in the other cases and materially affect the disposal thereof. The President (the other members not being able to join him) paid a visit to Melkote with the Muzrai Superintendent, with a view to make a personal inspection of the Yatiraja Matt, and the inscriptions on the temple walls and also to examine the temple accounts and see if they furnished any information about matters connected with this dispute. The Committee have also taken care to have the Swami represented before them though the petition purports to be from only a few disciples of the Matt.

8. As regards this claim, the Committee hold that the genuineness of the three important documents relied upon by the Swami of the Sri Yatiraja Matt, viz., Niyamanappadi, Nirup of Vijaya (corresponding to 1653 A.D.) purporting to have been issued by His Highness Kantirava Narasaraja Wadeyar and Nirup of Khara (1831) purporting to have been issued by His Highness Sri Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur, III, have not been

proved, that there is no reliable evidence that the Nirup of Prajotpatti (1811) upon which the claim of Sri Parakala Matt is based, was ever modified by any subsequent Sannad or order, or that the practice of giving Agra Tirtha to a Grihasta Gumasta of the Sri Parakala Matt in preference to a Yati or Acharyapurusha is inconsistent with the usages prevailing in important temples in Southern India or Mysore, and that the Swamy of the Sri Yatiraja Matt has not made out a right to be served with Agra Tirtha honours before the Gumastas of the Sri Parakala Matt in the Melkote temple.

Government agree in these findings.

9. The case next in importance is the Malur case which in 1895 was decided by Government in favour of the Acharyapurushas Anandam Pillay Apprameyangar and Veerambudhi Srinivasiengar. The right of these to Agra Tirtha is not only denied by the Sri Parakala Matt but also by Embar Krishnamachar, another Acharyapurusha who claims precedence with respect to these Acharyapurushas while he has no serious objection to accept Tirtha after the Matt Gumasta. The Parakala Matt, Anandam Pillay Apprameyangar and Embar Krishnamachar appeared before the Committee to support their cases but the Veerambudhi family was unrepresented.

10. In this case the Committee have considered the following among other questions:--

(1) (a) Whether the Nirup of 1811 relied upon by the Sri Parakala Matt is genuine, (b) what is the construction to be put upon it and (c) whether it should be enforced absolutely in all the Vishnu temples in the State.

(2) Are the special Sannad of 1819 purporting to confer Agra Tirtha in the Malur temple on the Anandam Pillay and Veerambudhi families and the General Sannad of the same year purporting to modify the Sannad of 1811 relied upon by Anandam Pillay Apprameyangar, genuine and how do they modify the Sannad of 1811?

(3) Whether the Sri Parakala Matt enjoyed Agra Tirtha honours prior to 1864 when the dispute first commenced and how long?

(4) Whether the Anandam Pillay or Embar family enjoyed Agra Tirtha honours and if so, for what periods?

(5) Are the Embars entitled to precedence over the Anandam Pillays?

(6) What are the objections to Gumastas receiving Agra Tirtha honours?

11. The Committee are unanimous in their findings on questions 2 to 5 noted above.

These findings are:--

(2) that the General and Special Sannads of 1819 are fabrications and that the Sannad of 1811 has not been modified

by any subsequent Sannad, (3 and 4) that after the issue of the Nirup of 1811 the Matt had Gumastas for receiving Agra Tirtha that it must be presumed to have so received the honours for many years until 10 or 15 years prior to 1864 when the Embars appear to have commenced to receive the said honours and that in 1864 the Matt's claim was again revived and admitted for some years until about 1872 or so, when on the complaint of Anandam Pillays and Veerambudhi Srinivasiengar the right was objected to, (5) that the Embar family have been enjoying precedence over the Anandam Pillay family.

Government accept these findings.

12. As regards the first and the last questions there is a difference of opinion among the members of the Committee. The majority consisting of Messrs. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar and D. Shama Rao hold on the former,

(a) that the Sannad of 1811 is genuine

(b) that it is not personal to Sri Ghantavatara Parakalaswami but also applies to the successors in the Matt and to Gumastas appointed by them, and

(c) that the Matt can succeed only in cases where it is able to prove enjoyment in pursuance of the Sannad.

13. In connection with the last and the

most important question of the series, the majority are of opinion that the Tirtha honours were generally granted by Rajas who built or endowed temples within their territories or were acquired by persons of great merit or influence and transmitted by mamul to their descendants, that the Hakdars enjoyed such honours either in person or by members of their family or Gumastas, and that even Yatis or Grihastas of exceptional merit were not allowed to hav precedence over them and that if the former did not like to receive Tirtha and other honours after the Hakdars in the Goshti at the time of Sattumurai they had to visit the temples at other times.

14. They add that these honours are generally paid only after Sattumurai at the time of the daily worship of the idol or on occasions of festivals or when the idols are taken to places in Mantapadi or Cherlup, that the idea is that the God is served first and then by his command the Acharya-purushas or persons entitled to special honours are called by Arulappadu and presented with the Tirtha and other Prasada of the God, that this cannot apply to the chance visitors of the temple and that the payment of these honours to individuals by reason of a right or mamul cannot amount to any disrespect to others although of higher standing who could come at other times and receive special honours to which their status may entitle them.

15. Mr. Ramaiya, on the other hand is

of opinion that the document of 1811 is only a Rahadari shewing the desire of His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wadeyar Bahadur, III, to honour the person of his Guru, that it does not contemplate the appointment of permanent Gumastas or the permanent deprivation of Yatis, Mathadipaties or others, of the honour due to their rank and position and their Asrama, that the document was intended to be used only on the occasions of the Sri Parakala Swamy's tour with a view to the Matt Agent or blood-relation of the Swami ~~in his former Asrama~~ being given precedence over the local Sri Vaishnavas.

16. Mr. Ramaiya further adds that by virtue of renunciation and self sacrifice in the service of humanity a Yati, according to Hindu Dharma, is entitled to greater consideration both from Rulers and the general public than a Grihasta however learned and high he may be, that though the Raja Guru, even when he happens to be ~~though he is~~ a junior Yati, is personally entitled to first Thirtha, ~~that~~ it is not fair to give first Tirtha to the Raja Guru's Gumasta, an ordinary Grihasta, when a Yati or Mathadhipati is present, and that, as honours are intended to be shewn in public assemblies, it would be an insult to require Yatis or Mathadipaties to keep away from Sattumurai and appear later on and receive honours.

17. The Government of His Highness the Maharaja have given their most anxious consideration to the arguments advanced in

support of these divergent views and are pleased to accept the recommendations of the majority of the Committee which are also in accordance with the practice prevailing in most of the important Sri Vaishnava temples in the Madras Presidency.

18. In the Kadaba temple case, Kadambi Garudachar who in 1894 disputed the Sri Parakala Matt's right is now dead. His brother's son Venkatanarasimhachar appeared before the Committee and opposed the Matt's claim. The finding of the Committee is that the genuineness of the Sannad of 1829 produced by the Kadambi family is doubtful, that the Kadambi family were for a long period not in enjoyment of Agra Tirtha, that it is very unlikely Garudachar would have got the honours in 1881, if he had not put forward the Srimukha of the Matt, and that there is no satisfactory evidence about the enjoyment of the honours by the Sri Parakala Matt Gumasta prior to 1881 when in accordance with his Vignapana Patrika to the Matt and the Srimukha of the Matt to him, Garudachar became the ~~Matt~~ Gumasta of the Matha.

19. Considering the peculiar circumstances of this case, the Committee suggest a compromise to the effect that the Agra Tirtha honours in temples of Kadaba and Sampige (which follows the usage in the former temple) shall vest in the Sri Parakala Matt, to be paid to second counter-petitioner and his descendants as the Agent of the Matt in accordance with the terms stipulated in the deceased Garudachar's

Garudachar's Vignapana Patrika and the Srimukha issued by the Matt. The suggestion is suitable and is accepted by Government.

20. In the temples referred to above the dispute was between the Sri Parakala Matt on one side and the Sri Yatiraja Matt or Sri Vaishnava Acharyapurushas on the other. In the Malekal-Tirupati case (the usage in which is also followed in the Kesava Devaru temple at Banavar) the parties opposing the Matt are Smarthas.

21. As regards this case the Committee are of opinion that there is neither oral nor documentary evidence to show that the Matt had any Gumasta in the temples or that the Sannad of 1811 had been brought into force there; and recommend that in accordance with the principle that the privilege under the Sannad of 1811 should not be brought into operation newly, the claim of the Matt should be disallowed.

22. Government agree in this view of the Committee. To the extent indicated in paras 11, 17 and 19 above the order of Government conveyed in paras 3 and 4 of Government Proceedings No.C.42-5 dated 15th March 1895 is modified and it is ordered (1) that in the Malur and Melkote temples the Sri Parakala Matt Gumasta should have Agra Tirtha in preference to all others, (2) that in the Kadaba and Sampige temples Kadambi Venkatanarasimha Char and his family are to be hereditary Gumastas of the Sri Parakala Matt and to receive the

Agra Tirtha, (3) that in the Malekal Tirupati and Banavar temples the Ayyanavaru family should continue to get Agra Tirtha, the Matt having no claim to the same and (4) that the order of precedence for Tirtha honours in Malur after the Matt is served, should be Embars, Anandam Pillay and Nallan Chakravarthy simultaneously and Virambudhi last

23. In submitting suggestions for future guidance the majority of the Commitee have touched upon the origin and nature of these Tirtha honours, the occasions when they are granted and the practice regulating the observance with reference to distinguished visitors. They are of opinion that the practice is well established and does not call for a change. The majority are further of opinion that the system of employing Gumastas is widely recognized and is not against the ~~genuine~~ genius.of Hindu usages and that it is not desirable to meddle with it. But in order that the system may not be abused unduly, the person appointed should be of a good family with some knowledge of Veda and Prabhanda and that he should not be of bad character. It is recommended that the complaints on this behalf should be cognisable by the Muzrai Officer whose orders as to the fitness of the Gumastas should be considered as final and that in order that the Hakdars may not be inconveaienced by the strict enforcement of the rule owing to difficulty in finding suitable men, the Tirtha honours may be kept in abeyance wibhout being liab~~ility~~le ~~of their being~~ to be barred by

limitation. These recommendations are well considered and the Government are pleased to accept them.

24. Having dealt with the several matters in dispute, Government desire to record their appreciation of the arduous services of the President and Members of the Committee and to convey to them their thanks. The hearing of the cases has not only taken much time but much labour must have been involved in scrutinizing the mass of Kannada records and exhibits. Much of this work fell on Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Praveena Mr. A. Rangasamy Iyengar, the President, who has spared no pains to find out the truth.

Revenue Commissioner's Office.

T. V. Ramasastry.	Rs.30
K. Shama Iyengar.	Rs.30

Muzrai Superintendent's Office.

C. Krishnamurty Rao.	Rs.35
M. Ramaswamayya.	Rs.25
A. Nanjappa.	Rs.15

25. Government are also pleased to sanction as recommended by the Committee the grant of bonuses, as shewn in the margin to the clerks who are reported to have worked hard out of office hours in connection with these cases.

14. 5. 15

For Offg.Secretary to Govt.

17/5/15

To

The Deputy Commissioners of Mysore
Bangalore, Tumkur and Hassan
Districts.
" Comptroller to the Government of
Mysore.
" Deputy Commissioner of other
Districts for information.
" Agent, Sri Parakal Swami Mutt.
" " Sri Yatiraja Mutt.
" Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore.
" Palace Controller, Mysore.
Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Praveena Mr. A.
Rangaswami Iyengar, B.A. [illegible]
Mr. H. Ramaiya
Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Prasakta Mr.
[illegible]

limitation. These recommendations are well considered and the Government are pleased to accept them.

24. Having dealt with the several matters in dispute, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja desire to place on record their high appreciation of the valuable services rendered by the President and members of the Committee and to convey to them ~~their~~ their thanks. The work not only involved the expenditure of much time and labour but also required patience and intellectual grasp of a high order to unravel the intricacies of sectarian practices, to trace the bearing of old inscriptions and traditions, and to scrutinize a mass of vernacular records and exhibits. The brunt of the work naturally fell upon the President Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Pravina Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar who has spared neither time nor trouble to examine the complicated questions and submit well-thought-out suggestions for the consideration of Government. In this connection it is to be noted that this work was undertaken by Messrs. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar and D. Shama Rao in addition to their other duties as heads of important departments of the State and by Mr. Ramaiya in an honorary capacity.

25. The Government have also much pleasure in noting the Committee's appreciation of the valuable assistance

rendered to them by the Muzrai Superintendent Mr. Subramanya Iyer.

Revenue Commissioner's Office.

T. V. Ramasastry.	Rs.30
K. Shama Iyengar.	Rs.30

Muzrai Superintendent's Office.

C. Krishnamurty Rao.	Rs.35
H. Ramaswamayya.	Rs.25
A. Nanjappa.	Rs.15

26. The recommendation of the Committee to grant bonuses to the marginally noted clerks of the Revenue Commissioner's Office and the Muzrai Superintendent's Office who have worked hard in connection with these cases in addition to their regular work, is also sanctioned.

14.5.15

For Offg.Secretary to Govt.

To

The Deputy Commissioners of Mysore, Bangalore, Tumkur and Hassan Districts.

" Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.

" Deputy Commissioners of other Districts for information.

" Agent, Sri Parakala Swami Matt.

" " Sri Yatiraja Matt.

" Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore.

" Palace Controller, Mysore.

Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Pravina Mr. A. Rangasami Iyengar, B.A. B.L.

Rao Bahadur Rajakarya Prasakta Mr. D. Shama Rao.

Mr. H. Ramaiya.